

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge the indication of the allowability of the subject matter of Claim 26 and 31, as set forth in item 5 on page 3 of the Office Action. By the foregoing amendment, the latter claims have been rewritten in independent form, and are therefore now believed to be allowable.

Claims 11-25, 27-30 and 32-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Stafford (International Patent Document WO 01/09562); while Claims 11-15, 17-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35 and 36 have been rejected as anticipated by Scherrer et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,250,950). However, for the reasons set forth hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims which remain of record in this application distinguish over the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination with other references.

As an initial matter, Applicants note that Claims 16, 23, 29 and 34, which have now also been rewritten in independent form, recite that the panels which make up the "array" are generally curved. Insofar as Applicants have been able to determine this feature of the invention is neither taught nor suggested by either of the cited references. In this regard, it is noted that the Office Action at page 3 indicates that the Stafford reference discloses this feature, referring in particular to page 3, lines 22-24 and page 4, lines 26 and 27. However,

Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited portions of the specification suggests such a feature. In particular, the specification at page 3, lines 22-24 says that the “surface to which an array according to the invention is attached will include...curved surfaces.” It is apparent, however, that this statement refers to the configuration of the surface on which the panels are attached, and not to the configuration of the panels themselves. Indeed, the specification specifically states at page 2, line 17 that the reflective surfaces have “substantially planar faces”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 16, 23, 29 and 34 are also allowable.

Claim 11, on the other hand, has been amended to recite that the array of the of reflective panels “is positioned at a location that is separated at a distance from said at least one object”. This limitation is supported in the specification at least at page 2, line 17, which states that the array “may be attached to an outer surface of each object or may be placed distant from each object. This feature of the invention is of particular relevance when the objects to be masked are statically sited permanent structures, such as buildings or wind turbines, as indicated, for example, at page 2, lines 4 and 5. In particular, a configuration according to Claim 11 as amended, is especially suitable for permanently located fixed objects. On the other hand, it is clearly unsuitable for use with vehicles, such a aircraft and vessels, whose position is constantly changing such that the

array needs to be applied to the outer surface of the vehicle in order to remain effective. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 as amended, and also Claim 36 which has been amended in a similar manner, distinguish over the cited references, and are therefore allowable.

In addition, Applicants have also added new Claims 37-39, which are directed to a method of reducing adverse effects of a structure upon reception of electromagnetic radio communications by at least one receiver that is situated such as to be able to receive electromagnetic radiation that is emitted from a source and is reflected by the structure. Both of the cited references, on the other hand, are directed to so-called stealth technology, the purpose of which is to reduce the radar signature of a vehicle or aircraft. Accordingly, neither of these references teaches or suggests a method for reducing the adverse effects on radio communications attributable to the reflection of radio signals from objects such as buildings and wind turbines. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that Claims 37 and 39 also distinguish over the cited references.

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application should be in consideration for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the

application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #101709.55374US).

Respectfully submitted,



Gary R. Edwards

Registration No. 31,824

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
GRE:kms
6157992_1